



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,553	02/25/2002	Hung Liang Chiu	P67638US0	8283
136	7590	07/03/2006	EXAMINER	
JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC 400 SEVENTH STREET N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20004			FISHER, MICHAEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/080,553

Applicant(s)

CHIU ET AL.

Examiner

Michael J. Fisher

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the real situation" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the original plan" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "each relevant administrator" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

As to claim 14, the term "CTO" is described in the specification as being "configured to order" while in the claim it is described as being "customer to order", thereby rendering the scope of the claim unclear and indefinite.

Note: For examiner purposes, it will be assumed that the term is meant to be "configured to order".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Art Unit: 3629

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5,7,8,10,12-15 and, as best understood, 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US PAT 6,078,924 to Ainsbury et al. (Ainsbury).

As to claim 1, Ainsbury discloses a method of integrating different information platforms in a decision making system comprising the steps of:

The enterprise downloading at least one set of data (fig 1, section 1 "Data Retrieval") from the Internet (14, fig 1) to a shared folder (section 2, fig 1), integrating the data (section 4), distributing the data to a user (25, as best seen in fig 1).

As to claim 2, Ainsbury uses the Internet (col 14, lines 31-32, "Internet Explorer").

As to claim 3, Ainsbury uses a network backbone (fig 1).

As to claim 4, Ainsbury the network structure has the function of communications and data transmissions (fig 1).

As to claim 5, Ainsbury discloses an SQL server (col 7, lines 26-28).

As to claim 7, the various systems would inherently be incompatible else they would not need to be integrated.

As to claim 8, Ainsbury discloses using a website (Inherent in that, as discussed in relation to claim 2, the system uses Internet Explorer).

As to claim 10, Ainsbury uses a website therefore, it would, of necessity, be either internal or external.

Art Unit: 3629

As to claim 12, the information is transmitted to an information mediator (inherent in that the information is mediated) through a network backbone (fig 1), the data is transferred to a target end (client desktop) wherein the user uses a browser (Internet Explorer).

As to claim 13, there are format conversions using a data converter (abstract lines 20-23).

As to claim 14, as best understood, the output would inherently be "configured to order" by the customer else the customer could not read the output and Ainsbury discloses the output as being in a variety of configurations (25, fig 1). .

As to claim 15, Ainsbury discloses a target end provided by the information mediator that stores data of the users and the enterprise (fig 4).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 3629

Claims 6,9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ainsbury.

As to claim 6, as the information is gathered for a client, it would have been obvious to compare the actual results with projected results to discover if the project is working as planned or not.

As to claim 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use an E-mail program to disseminate the information as this is a well known as a good way to disseminate information.

As to claim 11, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the user to view the information directly from the integration platform to ensure the proper information is being integrated.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Fisher whose telephone number is 571-272-6804. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30am-5:00pm alt Fri. off.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Fisher



Patent Examiner  
GAU 3629

MF   
6/23/06